



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/623,746

07/21/2003

Eric L. Andersen

100202636-1

7520

22879

7590

03/04/2009

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DULANEY, BENJAMIN O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/04/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 2/9/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that Beaven does not teach presenting the user with an option to keep a condition that throws a conflict, examiner disagrees. In column 4, line 48 Beaven refers to conditions that create possible conflicts that "**may** not be compatible" and again on line 60 refers to the mirror function and choice of transparency "which **may** not be a desired outcome by the user". Giving a user the opportunity to fix conditions that **might** be a problem and forcing a user to fix conditions that are totally incompatible are two very different things, and it is also very clear which procedure the system of Beaven would fall under. The entire stated purpose of Beaven, as seen in column 1, lines 49-51, is to **not** limit the "applicability and flexibility" of the operating system because of the "interdependency of the printer operating code and the GUI code"; and if Beaven operated as applicant's suggest (to disallow certain options to be used with one another when a conflict is thrown), it would create a system that is more rigid, not more flexible. In other words, the purpose of Beaven's "conflicts" is to verify that a user really wants to perform a certain action, which certainly suggests (if not outright teaches) a user's option to continue with settings that **may** not give a desired outcome. Therefore Beaven does teach the ability to form a mirror image on a sheet of transparency.

Regarding applicant's argument that Beaven does not teach an automatic mirror function, examiner disagrees. Beaven clearly states in column 4, lines 55-57 that a user

Art Unit: 2625

chooses a transparency setting which “causes the printer driver to perform a mirror function”; hence the choice of transparency is ***automatically*** linked to the mirror function. Therefore the disputed feature is taught.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625